

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA**

EARL MITCHELL, JR.,

Petitioner,

V.

**ROBERT HOUSTON, Director
Nebraska Dept. of Correctional
Services,**

Respondent.

CASE NO. 4:09CV3174

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the court on its own motion. On September 29, 2009, the Clerk of the court sent a Memorandum and Order (Filing No. [10](#)) to Earl Mitchell, Jr. (“Mitchell”) at his last known address. On October 5, 2009, that document was returned to the court as undeliverable and resent to Mitchell at the forwarding address provided on the returned document. (Filing No. [11](#).) On October 13, 2009, the document was, again, returned to the court as undeliverable. (Filing No. [12](#).) The court entered a Memorandum and Order on December 29, 2009, requiring Petitioner to update his address no later than January 29, 2010. (Filing No. [16](#).) Petitioner has failed to do so. In its previous Memorandum and order, the court warned Petitioner that failure to inform the court of his current address by January 29, 2010 would result in dismissal without prejudice and without further notice. (*Id.*)

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff failed to respond to the court's December 29, 2009, Memorandum and Order requiring that he provide the court with a current address. This action is therefore dismissed without prejudice; and

2. A separate judgment will be entered in accordance with this Memorandum and Order.

DATED this 2nd day of February, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

s/Laurie Smith Camp
United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.